DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 546 EA 023 046

AUTHOR Benson-Burrell, Brenda
TITLE Teacher to Teacher: Collaboration between the College Supervisor and Classroom Teacher in Pre-Service. Practitioner-Directed Action Research: Research Design and Planning Model.
PUB DATE Apr 91
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Clinical Experience; *College School Cooperation; Cooperative Education; Experiential Learning; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Practicum Supervision; Secondary Education; Work Experience Programs

ABSTRACT

A university/secondary school collaboration (Glassboro State College/Paulsboro School District, New Jersey) program that preplanned the field-based experiences of educational administration students is described in this report. The collaboration occurred between a college supervisor for the field-based experiences required in a Secondary Methods of Social Studies course and a 7-12 social studies department of a local school district. The study sought to determine whether or not preplanning provides administrator education students with a comprehensive background of theory and practice required by professional education. Pre- and post-surveys were mailed to participating and nonparticipating field-based teachers. Sixteen out of 34 nonparticipating and 6 out of 6 participating classroom teachers responded to the presurvey and 12 out of 34 nonparticipating and 6 out of 6 participating teachers responded to the postsurvey. Nonparticipants reported greater understanding of goals and expectations and supervisor awareness of students' field experience situations in the presurvey than in the postsurvey. Participating teachers demonstrated increased awareness and understanding in the postsurvey. A conclusion based on students' logs, coordinating teachers' data, and observation is that the school-based activities were beneficial to the total professional education program of preservice teachers. Three tables are included. The planning model is included in the appendix. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Benson-Burrell
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED333546

Session 15.15

Paper Presentation

Practitioner-Directed Action Research

Brenda Benson-Burrell
Glassboro State College

Teacher to Teacher: Collaboration Between the College Supervisor and Classroom Teacher Inservice

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PLANNING MODEL

1991 AERA Annual Meeting, Chicago

Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SECONDARY EDUCATION

Glassboro State College
Robinson Building, 2nd Floor
Glassboro, NJ 08028
(609) - 863 - 6071

Home:
58 Railroad Avenue
Woodbury, NJ 08096
(609) 848 - 3410

Fax# (609) 863 - 5018

EA 023046

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Glassboro State College
Secondary Education/Foundations Department
Robinson Building
Glassboro, N.J. 08028
Contact Person/Title: Brenda Benson Burrell, Assistant Professor
Telephone: (609) 863-6071

Title: ***"Teacher to Teacher: Collaboration Between the College and Public Schools"***
Year Program Initiation: Academic year 1989/90

ABSTRACT: ***"Teacher to Teacher: Collaboration Between the College and Public Schools"*** **- The college professor/supervisor for the field-based experiences required in the Secondary Methods of Social Studies course collaborated with a 7-12 social studies department of a local school district the semester before students entered the school setting to pre-planned the field-based experiences and develop, sequence, and coordinate the theories and practices needed for pre-service professional educators.**

Rationale for initiating the project

Nature of Research: If the college supervisor for the field-based experiences required in the Secondary Methods of Social Studies course and a 7-12 social studies department of a local school district jointly pre-planned the field-based experiences for the whole class before students entered the school district, could the experiences be developed, sequenced, and coordinated to provide students with a comprehensive background of the theories and practices needed as professional educators?

Goals of the program

There were four specific goals for the program:

1. **Since classroom teachers view college professors as *"removed"* from the classroom, the college professor established a rapport with classroom teachers by working as partners in developing programs for pre-service teachers.**

2. **Because the college professor had expanded knowledge of current content research activities and trends in content fields of study, opportunities were arranged and in-service workshops were provided and designed around the school district's perceived needs and the college professor's knowledge of what the pre-service students would need during their field based experiences.**

3. **Because pre-service teachers need coordinated field-based experiences with in-class instruction, the collaboration between a college professor and local school district reinforced concepts taught in theory as they related to practice.**

4. **Since secondary social studies teachers often teach a variety of required and elective courses (7-12), pre-service social studies teachers needed experiences that would give them the opportunity to observe all content areas taught in an educational setting. They became aware of all content areas that they might be *"called upon"* to teach when they enter their student teaching experience and continue their professional development as classroom teachers.**

Creative/innovative aspects

During the Spring 1989 semester, Dr. Brenda Benson Burrell met with the social studies department chairpersons at the middle school and high school in Washington Township. This meeting took place because Dr. Benson-Burrell wanted to place students in a 7-12 setting that would permit the students to have 20 hours of field-based experiences in 7-9 classrooms and 20 hours in 10-12 classrooms. No pre-planning with the departments took place. Dr. Benson-Burrell shared with the departments the kinds of experiences that she thought that students needed.

As a pilot, this process met the objectives of the field-based experience. The methods students shared a common instructional environment and the teachers at Washington Township provided an enriched setting.

During the Spring 1989 semester, Dr. Benson-Burrell was involved in several school/department study groups: Knowledge Base for Teacher Education (Putman), Study Group for Student Teacher Supervision (Sharp), and MST course planning (Bolay). She also studied AACTE's response to NCATE's Knowledge Base and Related Standards (1989). Based on Standard II. A: Clinical and Field-Based Experiences, she found that collaborative relationships are encouraged and that students should be provided opportunities to work with culturally diverse populations (pp. 54-55).

With this information in mind, Dr. Benson-Burrell met with the Superintendent of Paulsboro Public Schools and shared her ideas for a collaborative project based on the pilot. He welcomed the idea and was pleased to have teachers participate in the planning processes. In June 1989, Dr. Benson-Burrell met with the head of the social studies department, school principal, and the district's curriculum director to discuss the project and coordinate activities. Board of education approval was given in July 1989. During August, planning was done with the department head. The project started on the first day of school held at Paulsboro: Fall of 1989 and field-based experiences in Spring 1990.

Relationship to real problems in schools

Because college professors and classroom teachers have limited opportunities to share ideas about field-based experiences for pre-service teacher, this project offered the professional educators time to share common concerns in the areas of content, planning, and instructional practices. The following activities were jointly performed:

September 1989: arranged visits; met with social studies department and shared the goals and objectives of the Methods course and the goal of this research project. Reviewed district's curriculum and course of study. Reviewed professional staff's needs for professional development. Planned in-service activities with staff.

October 1989: arranged visits and visited classes to understand the cultural environment. Studied the K-12 programs of study for social studies. Continued to assist with staff's professional needs.

November and December 1989: arranged visits; designed field-based experiences; developed joint on-site classes for Spring 1990 class.

January 1990: Shared profiles of students enrolled in Methods class for Spring 1990.
February 1990: on-site class; tour, met staff etc.
February 15 - March 15, 1990, 20 hours of field-based observations completed.
After March 15, 1990: On site classes and joint workshops.
End of March to April 25, 1990: 40 hours of field-bases studies completed.
May 1990: Joint Meeting with Dr. Benson-Burrell and social studies team.

Data

Investigation Data Collection

1. A pre/post field-based survey was developed to gain perceptions of what the field-based experiences for methods students should be. The survey was given in February 1990 to participants in the collaboration project and non-participants (school districts).

   The Professional Laboratory Experiences Office coordinates the selection of cooperating field-based public school teachers. The Secondary Education/Foundation Department has five full-time professors that teach and supervise secondary methods and techniques classes: business, foreign languages, math, English, and social studies.

   In February 1990 and May 1990, surveys were mailed to 34 non-participating cooperating field-based teachers and six teachers that were participating cooperating field-based teachers. Sixteen non-participants returned the pre-survey; all six participants returned the pre-survey. Post data was returned from twelve non-participants; all six were returned from project participants.

2. Annotated records were kept by Dr. Benson-Burrell and social studies teachers.

Funding: Challenge Grant: Objective 4

Establish a comprehensive faculty development program for teacher educators.

Key Element:

"A Major professional development effort will undergird both the graduate level pre-service teacher preparation program and the five year integrated program. All teacher education faculty will have opportunity for professional revitalization and renewal.

"A variety of faculty development activities will be needed if we are to accomplish our goal of liberalizing teacher education programs at Glassboro. These activities must serve to support the faculty's commitment to excellence as well as assist them in integrating liberalizing components into the new teacher education programs. The nature and scope of faculty development activities required for designing and teaching in these programs has been described in prior sections. Of equal importance are development activities that promote revitalization and renewal and foster an atmosphere of intellectual excitement.

"Systematically supporting faculty involvement with research is especially important when major curricular changes are planned. We believe it is essential that all of our teacher education faculty become increasingly familiar with state of-the-art research in teaching and with the application of research findings to the K-12 classroom and to the preparation of teachers. To do so we propose to establish a collaborative relationship with a major research university and to develop a Visiting Scholars and Summer Seminars Program. Visiting Scholars will spend the summer in residence at Glassboro and lead the seminars; visiting consultants will also join as seminar faculty, but for shorter periods of time. During the academic year faculty will be encouraged to participate in semester-long study groups devoted to topics of common interest and to work collaboratively with public school teachers in applied research projects that focus on instructional practices.

Encourage collaborative applied research projects with public school teachers.

"This program component will promote faculty development through the support of applied research projects conducted by teacher education faculty in collaboration with public school teachers and students. It will focus on applying research findings in learning and teaching to K-12 instructional practices.

"Activities to design and implement the program will be undertaken in Year 1 by a Collaborative Research Task Force comprised of three faculty members. The task force will develop criteria in concert with the School Dean for program participation and a system for implementing this grand award program. Resources for the support of four collaborative research projects are requested projects are requested in Year 1 and for five collaborative research projects in Year 2 and in Year 3. Each research award will provide released time support for the Glassboro Faculty member serving as project director, a stipend for the collaborating classroom teacher and support for equipment and materials."

Raw Survey Data

The results of the pre/post survey were:

TABLE ONE
Survey of Perceptions of Secondary Methods & Techniques School-Based Experiences:
Pre-Field Based Data

		A*		B**	
	Questions	*Y*	*N*	*Y*	*N*
1.	Do you know and understand the goals and objectives of this course?	13	3	6	
2.	Has the college supervisor shared the contents of the course?	7	9	6	
3.	Has the college supervisor planned the school-based experiences with you?	2	14	6	
4.	Do you know what is expected of you as a coordinating teacher?	13	3	6	
5.	Is the college supervisor aware of your present instructional program and courses of study?	3	12 (1)	6	
6.	Is the college supervisor aware of the types of students in your classes?	3	12 (1)	6	
7.	Does the college supervisor understand the cultural profile of school and its community?	7	9	6	
8.	Is the supervisor aware of the scope and sequence of your secondary content area(s)?	5	11	6	

* A - Non-Participants (N=16)
** B - Participants (N=6)

TABLE TWO
Survey of Perceptions of Secondary Methods & Techniques School-Based Experiences:
Post-Field Based Data

		A*		B**	
	Questions	*Y*	*N*	*Y*	*N*
1.	I have a better understanding of the goals and objectives of this course.	10	2	6	
2.	During the semester, the college supervisor has continued to share the aspects of this program with me.	2	10	5	1
3.	During the semester, the college supervisor and I planned school-based experiences together.	2	10	4	2
4.	I now have a better understanding of my role as a coordinating teacher.	10	2	6	
5.	The college supervisor has a deeper understanding of the instructional programs and courses of study in my content area(s).	3	9	6	
6.	The college supervisor knows the types of students who enroll in my classes.	2	10	6	
7.	The college supervisor knows the cultural profile of our school and its community.	2	10	6	
8.	The college supervisor is aware of our program of studies with regard to the secondary instructional scope and sequence presented in my content area(s).	2	10	6	

*** A - Non-participants (N=12)**
**** B - Participants (N=6)**

Pre/Post Data Presented in Percentages

	Pre: Percent of "Yes"		*Post: Percent of "Yes"*	
Item	*A**	*B***	*A**	*B***
1	.81	1.	.83	1
2	.44	1.	.16	.83
3	.13	1.	.16	.66
4	.81	1.	.83	1.
5	.20	1.	.25	1.
6	.20	1.	.16	1.
7	.44	1.	.16	1.
8	.31	1.	.16	1.

* A - Non-participants
** B - Participants

Review of Data

Respondents that answered the first question felt that they "knew and understood the goals and objectives of the secondary methods and techniques school-based portion of the course". Participants reported that 100 percent understood the goals and objectives before and after the field-based experience. For non-participants, 81 percent understood the concepts before the school-based experience and 83 percent understood after the school-based experience. The perceptions of both groups remained almost the same.

Respondents that answered the second question "about sharing in developing the school-based experiences together" had extremely different perceptions. Forty-four percent of the non-participants stated that the supervisor shared course content before the school-based experience, but 16 percent reported that the college supervisor shared aspects of the program during the semester. For participants, 100 percent recorded sharing course content before school-based experiences while 83 percent reported a continuation of sharing course ideas during the semester.

Respondents that answered the third question concerning "planning school-based experiences together" reported extreme results. For non-participants, 13 percent recorded planning experiences before the school-based experience and 16 percent participated during the semester. Participants recorded 100 percent participation before and 66 percent during the semester.

Respondents that answered question four about "their role as cooperating teachers" reported little or no change in their perceptions. For non-participants, the pre-school based perception was 81 percent and 83 percent for post-school based perceptions. For participants 100 percent was reported for pre/post perceptions.

Respondents that answered the fifth question about "the college supervisor's understanding of the instructional programs/courses of study" reported little or no change in perceptions. For non-participants, pre-data revealed that 20 percent felt the supervisor understood instructional programs. Post-date revealed that 25 percent had a better understanding of instructional programs after the school-based experience was over. For participants, 100 percent recorded, pre and post, that the supervisor understood the instructional programs.

Respondents that answered question six about "types of students enrolled in classes" did not vary much. For non-participants, 20 percent recorded that supervisors knew the types of students enrolled in their pre-survey while 16 percent recorded that supervisors knew the types of students in their classes in the post survey. For participants, in pre and post data, 100 percent felt the supervisor knew the types of students enrolled in their classes.

For question seven, non-participants' perceptions were considerably changed between pre and post data collections: 44 percent pre and 16 percent post. The question dealt with "the college supervisor's understanding of the cultural profile of the school and community". For participants, the perception did not change: 100 percent pre and post data collections.

In question eight, the respondents recorded their perceptions "of the supervisors' knowledge of the content area's secondary scope and sequence." Non-participants recorded 31 percent in their pre-data and 16 percent in their post data. For participants, the perception did not change: 100 percent pre and post data collection.

Discussion of Data

Since the Methods and Techniques course requires a forty hour school-based component, it is important that the cooperating teacher and college supervisor work together in not only fully understand the goals and objectives of the total course but also planning school-based activities so that theory is linked to practice for the final school-based experiences before the pre-service teacher enters student teaching.

Respondents were invited to share comments on both pre and post surveys. As one reviewed the data and comments, some conclusion can be drawn that support the nature of this collaboration research.

Questions one asked if cooperating teachers knew the goals and objectives of the methods and techniques course. For non-participants, there was little difference between pre and post data (81% pre/ 83% post). Comments made by non-participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"Yes, as it helped me use the students effectively for both my own and their purposes"
"Yes, by listing the intern's responsibilities it is clear to me just how I can help him/her and vice versa."
"Only information was from principal. Students are to observe, mark papers, etc."
"Yes, I feel it gives a useful overall view to students of the all encompassing job of teaching."
"Yes, I understand the purpose of the practicum experience."
"Yes, It was....to plan activities"

Post Data Comments

"Never met instructor"
"Never talked to instructor"
"However, I am not sure if the student was! I do not feel that the student took full advantage of the opportunity afforded the student."
"Student had the opportunity to see what teaching and students performance are really like."
"College supervisor provided me with a course syllabus. Students always knew what was expected of them."

For participants, pre-data was 100%; post data was also 100%. Comments made by participants were as follows:

Pre-Data Comments

"Yes, I understood the student was to observe and not teach."
"A course description of goals and objectives was distributed to each teacher in the department."
"The goals were clearly spelled out for all to understand."
"Yes, it reinforces certain objectives and ideas."
"It was pretty clear in the syllabus"
"Many suggestions and information sheets"

Post Data Comments

"I felt that I understood the program before we started and I was not disappointed. It was an excellent program and I have enjoyed both semesters very much."
"The guidelines were helpful."

Based on the data, the sharing of the program's goals and objectives is useful in assisting cooperating teachers understand the purpose of the program (goals and objectives).

Question two asked if the college supervisor shared aspects of the program with the coordinating teacher. For non-participants there was a significant difference between pre and post data (44% pre/16% post). Comments made by non-participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"Being familiar with course content helps me to emphasize certain points to GSC students"
"Information would be useful. I do not even know in what areas the student has studied."
"I would like to speak to them before the students begin."
"More information would be useful."
"I don't think it would help."
"Last year, I received info on the course in written form, a visit, and verbally from the student."

Post Data Comments

"Never met or talked to instructor."
"Visited a few times and discussed student."
"I saw the supervisor once for about 2 minutes."
"Visited one day - had a class - just introduced"
"I only saw the college supervisor once at the beginning of the semester."
"I was disappointed with the lack of contact by college supervisor."

For participants, pre data was 100%; post data was 83%. Comments made by participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"Very, I knew the purpose of the course."
"Provided us with a syllabus which is helpful."
"Yes, it gave an overview of their situation."
"As enrichment"
"At various meetings"
"Yes, as background"

Post Data Comments

"(Supervisor) was in personal touch or in touch weekly through our students."
"The department chairperson shared the information, from the supervisor, with the rest of us."
"Very good contact."
"Continually updated me with information."
"We discussed the role that the student had taken in the classroom."

Based on the data, coordinating teachers favor developing a working relationship with college supervisors before and during the school-based experiences. Non-participants recorded that they, 44 percent of them, would be working with the college supervisor as the school-based program progressed. But, post-data showed that only 16 percent felt that the college supervisor shared information during the school-based experiences.

Participants recorded 100% participation during the pre school-based experience and 83% direct contact with the college supervisor in their post data survey.

Question three asked if the college supervisor planned school-based experiences with the coordinating teacher. Non-participants recorded low rates of participation before and after the field-based experiences (13 % pre/16% post). Comments made by non-participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"Would be useful,probably because we could more closely align our needs with GSC's ."
"Would be useful in understanding subject area of student's background."
"Information in the letter was adequate."
"Some might be helpful."
"Not necessary"

Post Data Comments

"Never met or talked to instructor."
"Never happened."
"I received absolutely no input before, during or after the semester."

For participants, pre data was 100%/post data was 66%. "Comments made by participants were as follows:

Pre-Data Comments

"Provided us with schedule of course and course requirements."
"Very useful, we all knew and understood the process."
"(Supervisor) gave us materials."
"It might have been done but due to coaching, I missed a couple of meetings."

Post Data Comments

"We discussed and organized weekly group meetings here at school. We discussed the lessons the students were to teach."
"I received the written materials and planned the content of the visits from them. The supervisor had a group meeting at the end."

Based on the data, coordinating teachers would like more input in planning the school-based experiences of pre-service teachers with the college supervisor.

Question four asked if coordinating teachers knew what was expected from them in their roles. Non-participants recorded almost the same perceptions in pre/post data (81% per/ 83% post). Comments made by non-participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"I try to plan activities which GSC students can work toward their course requirements."
"By reviewing the list of the intern's responsibilities, I can see what is expected of me as a cooperating teacher."
"I will try to give (the student) experiences in as many of the evaluation areas as possible."
"Students are not to take over any teaching responsibilities but will become familiar with classroom duties and procedures as well as tutoring."
"Guidance, I think."
"I would like to know what is expected. I would then be able to tell you what I will do."
"Supervise student in teacher responsibilities with the exception of actual teaching."
"Have student observe, do bulletin boards, mark tests."
"I have a list of possibilities for making the practicum experience meaningful."

Post Data Comments

"Never met or talked to instructor."
"I didn't really do that much. The (supervisor) did not ask for my advice."
"Since I have done this before, I used my past experiences and the course syllabus to determine my role - but I would not say my understanding was better."
"Yes, only because of trial and error and having gone through the experience."

Participants record 100% on pre and post data. Comments made by participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"We plan on involving the students in our daily work load."
"Basically, teach, and learn from the students from Glassboro State."
"Guidance, help and exchange."
"Students are to observe and participate in as many experiences that our school can offer."
"To have the students observe various aspects of education throughout the school system and to see and practice various methods and techniques of instruction."
"To allow the student to observe and then discuss and share about what was observed."

Post Data Comments

"As with any new experience, after first time one is more confident and knowledgeable."
"This time I knew more of what to expect and how to plan for the visits."
"I feel, after having these students this year, that next year's experience will run even smoother."

Based on the data, participants knew what was expected of them as coordinating teachers before and after the school-based experiences based on joint planning with the college supervisor. Non-participants recorded that they knew what was expected based on past experiences and written materials but not by coordination with the college supervisor.

Question five asked if college supervisors were aware of the instructional programs and courses of study in the content area(s). Non-participants reported about the same data on their pre/post perceptions (20% pre/ 25% post). Comments made by non-participants were as follows:

Pre Data Comments

"Not that I am aware of at this time."
"I don't know."
"I think it is a new supervisor from last year."
"Don't know."
"I do not know."
"I don't know"
"I'm really not sure."

Post Data Comments - No comments made

Participants reported 100 percent on pre and post data with regard to the college supervisor's awareness of instructional programs and courses of study in content areas. No comments were made on pre or post surveys.

Based on the data, coordinating teachers think that the college supervisor should be aware of the instructional program and courses taught in their classes. With this knowledge, school-based program could be coordinated for the benefit of the pre-service teacher.

Questions six, seven, and eight asked if college supervisors were knowledgeable about (6) types of students enrolled in classes, (7) cultural profile of the school and community, and (8) program of studies and secondary scope and sequence in the content area(s). For non-participants, other than "I don't know," no other comments were made.

Taking these three areas together, non-participants reported higher percentages in pre data survey then in post data survey.

TABLE FOUR
COLLEGE SUPERVISOR'S KNOWLEDGE

Question	*Pre*	*Post*
6 - types of students	20%	16%
7 - cultural profile	40%	16%
8 - program of studies	31%	16%

For participants, 100% felt that the supervisor was knowledgeable in each of the areas on pre and post data.

Based on the data, coordinating teachers seem to feel that the school-based experiences are enhanced when the college supervisor is knowledgeable in these areas.

Post data summary comments were made by non-participants and participants.

Comments from non participants were as follows:

"I did not work with the supervisor. I would have liked to have had more contact during the experience."
"I never met with or talked to the college supervisor."
"I would like more contact with the supervisor."
"I was not pleased with the scheduling of both my students on a Friday. I was unfamiliar with this program and received no input or contact from college supervisor. I enjoyed working with the students assigned to me, but I am reluctant to say 'yes' to this program again."
"I believe the college supervisor is generally cognizant of our overall program of studies since we have worked together a number of times in past year. While I think the supervisor has a general understanding of our types of students and our cultural profile, I do not believe the supervisor has kept up to date with changes in the last few years."
"Better communications with cooperating teacher."
"Never had any contact with Instructor only knowledge gained was from the student taking the Methods course. P.S. My Methods student did a very fine job."
"I am not sure if there is any in depth understanding perhaps on the surface - but to my knowledge these issues were not addressed."
"The college supervisor came in once and spoke to me for two minutes. All that the supervisor wanted to know was if the student came every week. I offered the information that the student graded tests for me and gave an oral presentation. We did not talk about any of the items in #5."

"I saw the college supervisor one time for about 10 minutes."

(1) Give better direction to students on what is expected of them.
(2) Have some coordination with the cooperating teacher.
(3) Show some interest in seeing what the students have done and are doing in their school.
(4) In other words make yourself more visible and involved."

Comments from participants were as follows:

"I feel that the program ran very well. The students involved were cooperative. The group that I had gave very good mini-lessons to the class."
"I really think this is a valuable program."
"I thought the program was very good. It gave me an opportunity to understand the role of the student and to use her as a resource person. The students enjoyed the chance to work with her in the mini-lesson."

Based on the records and discussions between Dr. Benson-Burrell and the methods students, the program has many positive features.

Data Collected from Student's Logs

Students were grouped into teams of three to four each. We made a group (class) visit on February 9, 1990 to meet the secondary social studies teachers at Paulsboro High School. From 2:30 - 4:00 p.m. we met each teacher, the principal, other teachers, and toured the building. There were six teachers and six teams of students. The students were rotated in six cycles so that they had six different instructional settings 7th - 12th grades.

The half-day, four hour visits were coordinated with the school's spring schedule. Student teams arranged to visit the school on different days of the week. One hour sessions were arranged for the whole group, by the department chairperson, with the principal, guidance director, districts' curriculum director, and student activities staff members. Because two social studies teachers serve in ancillary positions audio visual studies and sports activities were covered during the cycles by those social studies teachers when teams were assigned to that social studies teacher.

Within each cycle, teams had the opportunity to observe teachers outside the areas of social studies. Teams observed teachers in business education, foreign language, physical education, math, science, and art. After each cycle, students turned in a prepared journal form that gathered the following information: (1) time, (2) observations, (3) significant events, (4) personal reactions, impressions, evaluations, and (5) data collection based on topics of study in class. During the final cycle, cycle six, the team spent eight hours with this teacher in order to observe four hours and teach a mini-lesson during the final four hours.

After reading the student's logs, the following summary comments were made:

1. Students were pleased to work in teams.
2. Students were pleased that they observed a total of twelve different teachers and saw twelve different teaching styles and different types of students.
3. Students were pleased to observe the total 7-12 instructional program in social studies.
4. Students were pleased to observe teachers in other content areas and see some of the same students in different classes.
5. Students were impressed to learn about career opportunities within the field of education.
6. Students were pleased to learn of the many opportunities and responsibilities of being an educator (i.e., student activities, sports, A/V, etc.).
7. Students were pleased that their class studies were linked with their field-based cycle experiences.
8. Students were pleased that the college supervisor and coordinating teachers knew what was expected of them in every school-based activity.
9. Students developed mini-lessons with college supervisor and coordinating teachers monitored the lessons and evaluated the presentations.
10. Students were able to transfer the concepts learned in the course Secondary School Environment into this field-based experience and gain a better understanding of what is expected in their student teaching experiences.

Based on students' logs, coordinating teachers' data, and my experiences with this course, the school-based activities were beneficial to the total professional education program of our pre-service teachers.

Replicating the program

This program could be replicated if the following occurs:

1. Efforts must be made to find secondary content areas where all teacher participate in the project. This is a must!
2. Time must be spent in informal, *"getting to know you"*, settings as well as formal in-service settings.
3. College professor must be given the time to establish district level contacts and relationships on an on-going bases.
4. At least four district sites should be established so that one district is not used all of the time; nevertheless, all districts could be provided joint-in-service opportunities at any time. The college professor must be kept abreast of curriculum and instructional changes. Keep rapport established at all times - this takes time and funding.

PLANNING MANUAL
FOR FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES
IN METHODS AND TECHNIQUES

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies

Fall 1990

Gateway Regional Public Schools
Department of Social Studies

In Collaborations With

Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell,
Assistant Professor
Glassboro State College

September 1990

RECOGNITION:

THE PROCESSES DESIGNED IN THIS MANUAL WERE DEVELOPED JOINTLY WITH THE SOCIAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT AT PAULSBORO HIGH SCHOOL, PAULSBORO, NEW JERSEY WITH FUNDS PROVIDED BY THE CHALLENGE GRANT.

Fall 1990

FOREWORD

Since I started teaching this course in 1989, I wanted to design and develop a field-based component that translated theory into practice. Section IV gives a brief background about this effort; the other sections give a detailed account of the work that is presently being done with Gateway Regional High School's Social Studies Department in Woodbury Heights, New Jersey. The full research report is a separate document; nevertheless, planning is essential in developing these collaborative efforts.

Some ideas to consider before starting:

1. Find a secondary department that is 7-12 and located in the same building. This arrangement will make it easier for you, and your students, to get around". You will also find that you can coordinate your program more efficiently.

2. Review the courses of study for the content area(s) so that your can see the array of course selections offered 7-12. This will assist you in planning your class lectures, etc.

3. Discuss the field-based program with the superintendent, principal, department supervisor, etc. to make sure that the school system is in favor of working with you and your efforts.

Some ideas to get you started:

1. Prepare a written agenda and make a presentation to the content area department.

2. Invite the department to share their ideas for the program, and include their ideas wherever possible.

3. Gather all the information that is needed (i.e., teacher's handbook, teaching schedules, lunch periods, school calendar, special events, etc.). Review Sections I, II, and III to assist you in completing this portion.

After you have established two or three field-based school districts, you will have a better idea of how to adjust your program according to your instructional needs and the districts' desires. This process will take a lot of time; but the pay-off is great!

Your will establish

.....a working relationship with a content area department,

.....a common setting for your field-based component, and

.....a program that is coordinated for you and your students.

Brenda Benson-Burrell, Project Designer

SAMPLES OF COMMUNICATIONS:

TO: Mr. Russ Miller, Instructional Supervisor
FROM: Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell, Assistant Professor at Glassboro State
RE: Planning for Methods of Social Studies Students
DATE: September 6, 1990

MEMO:

I wish to thank you and the staff for the warm reception that I received during our planning meeting on September 5, 1990.

If the department wants to participate in this enriching professional experience, the following item should be considered:

1. I will need to prepare for our group visit on October 1st. I meet the students this Monday and will get a set time after our class.

2. I need seven key teachers to serve as "host" for each cycle. The host teachers will make arrangements with another social studies teacher, not one of the seven, and see that the students in each cycle observe along with him/her.

> ***Example: If Mr. Parker is a "host" teacher, he will make sure that students observe Mr. Ryan during the same day that they are with him (Mr. Parker)..***
>
> **EVEN IF ALL SOCIAL STUDIES TEACHERS PARTICIPATE, "HOST" TEACHERS WILL BE ENCOURAGED TO ASK OTHER CONTENT AREA TEACHERS TO PERMIT STUDENTS TO OBSERVE THEM. THE METHODS STUDENTS NEED TO SEE OTHER CONTENT AREAS TOO.**
>
> **HOST TEACHER SHARED TEACHER CONTENTAREA/GRADE**
>
> 1._____
> 2._____
> 3._____
> 4._____
> 5._____
> 6._____
> 7._____

Of course, I will submit the names of the students for approval in accordance with the school's policy.. Once the seven "host" teachers are selected, I will contact them via written communications and/or a personal visits during a time that they select.

Because I must make my plans with my students, I would appreciate a confirmation about our plans by Friday, September 14th. I can be reached at home (848-3410) or at the college (863-6071). Just call me and "I'll come running".

In closing, I wish you a successful school year; I look forward to working with you again.

CC. Mr.Dawson, superintendent
Mr.Furgione, curriculum supervisor
Mr.Bender, principal

GLASSBORO STATE COLLEGE
DR. BRENDA BENSON-BURRELL
(OFFICE: 863-6071) ; (HOME: 848-3410)
METHODS & MATERIALS IN SOCIAL STUDIES
FALL 1990 - FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES
WITH GATEWAY REGIONAL SOCIAL STUDIES DEPARTMENT
Egg Harbor Road, Woodbury Heights, NJ

September 10, 1990

I. SHARE INFORMATION ABOUT FALL 1990 PROGRAM:

A. ENROLLMENT AS OF SEPTEMBER 10, 1990 (college students)
B. CLASS ON MONDAYS FROM 4-6:40 P.M.
C. FIELD-BASED EXPERIENCES SCHEDULED FOR FRIDAY MORNINGS
D. NEED CLASS VISIT THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 1ST TO TOUR THE BUILDING (AFTER 3:30 P.M.)
E. STUDENTS IN GROUPS OF TWO; OBSERVING CLASSES 7-12
OCTOBER 1ST - CYCLE ONE - 5 HOURS
OCTOBER 15TH - CYCLE TWO - 5 HOURS
OCTOBER 22ND - CYCLE THREE - 5 HOURS
OCTOBER 29TH - CYCLE FOUR 5 HOURS
NOVEMBER 7TH HUMAN AWARENESS DAY - VARIES (5 HRS.)
NOVEMBER 26TH - CYCLE FIVE - 5 HOURS
DECEMBER 3RD - CYCLE SIX - 5 HOURS

II. PLANS TO BE DEVELOPED FOR EACH CYCLE:

CYCLE ONE - HAVE COURSE DESCRIPTIONS FOR ALL CLASSES BEING OBSERVED
CYCLE TWO - STUDENT PROFILES
CYCLE THREE - PLANNING INSTRUCTION
CYCLE FOUR - DIFFERING INSTRUCTION
CYCLE FIVE - REVISIONS TO INSTRUCTION
CYCLE SIX - SPECIAL NEEDS STUDENTS

III. OTHER AREAS OF OBSERVATION/INVESTIGATION (ONE PER GROUP)

GROUP 1. CURRICULUM SUPERVISOR
GROUP 2. SOCIAL STUDIES SUPERVISOR
GROUP 3. MEDIA CENTER
GROUP 4 STUDENT COUNCIL OR CLASS ADVISOR
GROUP 5 PRINCIPAL

IV. STUDENTS WILL FIND A RESEARCH QUESTION BASED ON THEIR CONTENT AREA "WEAKNESS"".

V. DEVELOP A CULTURAL STUDY BASED ON A COMMUNITY IN GLOUCESTER COUNTY INTO A UNIT PLAN

Ideas from teachers:

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies
Fall 1990 - Gateway Regional Public Schools Department of Social Studies
In Collaborations With
Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell, Assistant Professor, Glassboro State College

OBJECTIVE:

In order to build a realistic field-based experience for junior level preservice secondary teacher education students, a collaborative relationship is being established between the college professor for Secondary Methods and Techniques in Social Studies and a secondary instructional department of social studies (7-12)

There is one major objective:
...to develop a working relationship between the college supervisor and the classroom teachers that seeks to blend theory into practice within the 40 hour field-based component of the methods and techniques course.

STUDENTS THAT WILL BE VISITING GATEWAY REGIONAL
Mondays: Barbara Stephens and Richard McGonigle
Thursdays: Kenneth Katz and Sherry Devlin
Fridays: Paul Blass and Victoria Powers
Fridays: Kerri Williams and Drew Bates
Fridays: Hedy Skilowitz and Corinn Irick

WEEKS IN THE BUILDING

October 1st - Visit to school at 4:00 p.m.

Week of October 15th

Week of October 22nd

Week of October 29th

Students would like to share in
HUMAN AWARENESS DAY on November 7th

Week of November 26th

Week of December 3rd

September 20, 1990

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies
Fall 1990 - Gateway Regional Public Schools
Department of Social Studies
In Collaborations With
Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell, Assistant Professor
Glassboro State College
Home: 848-3410; College: 863-6071

Thank you for your cooperation and willingness to participate in this enriching professional experience for "our" future teachers. I am asking the teachers, listed below, to review the enclosed information and grant their approval. Student groups of two each will visit classes ONE DAY A WEEK on the dates listed in the master schedule:

Mrs. DiDio, Ms. Comfort, Mr. Parker, Mr. Moore,
Mr. Hartman, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Hughes, and Mr. Fisher

The students will have clear directions as to their dress, conduct, and responsibilities. All we need is "you" as a part of the total program. The names of the students, the DAY they will spend with you, and a completed daily schedule are enclosed BY TEACHER. Mr. Russ Miller has the complete set of teachers and schedules.

You will also note that students will not be visiting on consecutive weeks. There are so many "off day" during this semester. Please inform Mr. Miller if there are any problems with the arrangements as stated.
My major purpose is to have students observe a total secondary social studies program in grades 7-12.

Other Student Experiences

Friday, Sept. 21 - Workshop with Dr. Faison
Friday, Sept. 29 - Workshop with Dr. Faison
Friday, October 5 - arrange to visit "research town"
Friday, October 12 - visit EIRC-South
November 8 or 9 - attend NJEA

CC. Mr. Dawson
Mr. Bender

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies
Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell
MASTER SCHEDULE - 1990

Week	7/8	US I	US II	Mod	Other	7/8	US I	US II	Mod	Other
1	Mon: 10/15 Stephens & McGonigle	Th: 10/18 Katz & Devlin	F:10/19 Stilowitz & Irish	F:10/19 Williams & Bates	F:10/19 Bliss & Powers					
2		Mon 10/22	Th 10/25	F 10/26	F 10/26	F 10/26				
3			Mon 10/29	Th 11/1	F 11/2	F 11/2	F 11/2			
4				Mon 11/26	Th 11/29	F 11/30	F 11/30	F 11/30		
5					Mon 12/3	Th 12/6	F 12/7	F 12/7	F 12/7	

October 1st - Class at 4:00 pm at Gateway

GENERAL GROUP PLANNING FORM:

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies
Fall 1990 - Gateway Regional Public Schools
Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell, Assistant Professor
Home: 848-3410; College: 863: 6071

Professional Educators:_____
Content Areas:_____

Date of Field-Based Experience: _____

Students: _____

Arrival Time: _____

Period	Time	Teacher	Course/Room	SpecialComments
One	8:00 - 8:43			
Two	8:48 - 9:31			
Three	9:35 - 10:24			
Four	10:28 - 11:11			
Five	OPEN FOR LUNCH			
Six	AND OTHER TASKS			
Seven	1:23 - 2:06			
Eight	2:09 - 2:52			

****

MASTER OF TEACHERS' SCHEDULES: Students are assigned by the week.

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies
Fall 1990 - Gateway Regional Public Schools
Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell, Assistant Professor
Home: 848-3410; College: 863: 6071

Professional Educators: Hughes and Fisher **Content Areas: US History I**

Date of Field-Based Experience:
Students:
Arrival Time: 7:45

Period	Time	Teacher	Course/Room	Special Comments
One	8:00 - 8:43	Hughes	US I 400	
Two	8:48 - 9:31		open	Assigned College Tasks
Three	9:35 - 10:24	Fisher	same 312	
Four	10:28 - 11:11	Fisher	same 402	
	11:15 - 11:45	Lunch		
Five	11:49 - 12:32	Fisher	same 402	
Six	12:36 - 1:19	Fisher	same 402	
Seven	1:23 - 2:06			End of day
Eight	2:09 - 2:52			

FORMAT OF STUDENT'S WEEKLY SCHEDULES

Methods and Techniques of Secondary Social Studies
Fall 1990 - Gateway Regional Public Schools
Dr. Brenda Benson-Burrell, Assistant Professor
Home: 848-3410; College: 863: 6071

Professional Educators: Comfort and DiDio **Content Areas: Grades 7 and 8**

Date and Day of Field-Based Experience: October 15, 1990
Students: Mondays: Barbara Stephens and Richard McGonigle
Arrival Time: 8:30

Period	Time	Teacher	Course	Room
One	8:00 - 8:43	Arrive by 8:30		
Two	8:48 - 9:31	Comfort	Soc. St./7	210
Three	9:35 - 10:24	DiDio	Soc. St./8	210
Four	10:28 - 11:11	Comfort	same	206
Five	11:15 - 11:58	DiDio	same	210
Six	12:02 - 12:32	Lunch and visit to Jr. High Media Center		
Seven	1:23 - 2:06	DiDio	same	206
Eight	2:09 - 2:52	Comfort	same	206
End of Day				